
The Office of Food for Peace

ANNUAL REPORT

FY 2002



SO1: Critical food needs of targeted groups met.

SO2: Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.

MARCH 2002

Please Note:

The attached RESULTS INFORMATION is from the FY 2002 Annual report, and was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on the cover page.

The Annual Report is a “pre-decisional” USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse

1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200

Arlington, VA 22209-2111

Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106

Fax: 703/351-4039

Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org

Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after July 1, 2002

The attached results information is from the FY 2002 Annual Report for:

SO1 – DCHA/FFP Emergency Program Division and was assembled and analyzed by USAID/DCHA/FFP SO1.

SO2 – DCHA/FFP Development Program Division and was assembled and analyzed by USAID/DCHA/FFP SO2.

The Annual Report is a “pre-decisional” USAID document and does not reflect results of USAID budgetary reviews. Additional information on the attached can be obtained from:

SO1 – Jon Brause, Associate Director, DCHA/FFP Emergency Program Division.

SO2 – Richard Newberg, DCHA/FFP Development Program Division.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse

1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200

Arlington, VA 22209-2111

Telephone: 703-351-4006 Ext. 106

Fax: 703-351-4049

Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org

Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY.....	ii
PART III: PERFORMANCE NARRATIVE	
A. Strategic Objective One.....	13
B. Strategic Objective Two.....	23
PART IV: PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES AND RESULTS FRAMEWORKS.....	31

GLOSSARY

CDO	Cooperative Development Organization
CMR	Crude Mortality Rate
CS	Cooperating Sponsor
CY	Calendar Year
DAP	Development Assistance Program
EMOP	Emergency Operation Program
EU	European Union
EWS	Early Warning System
FANTA	Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance
FFE	Food for Education
FFP	Office of Food for Peace
FFW	Food for Work
FTF	Farmer-to-Farmer
ICDS	Integrated Child Development Services
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
INHP	Integrated Nutrition and Health Program
ISA	Institutional Strengthening Assistance
NEP	New Entry Professional
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
OTI	Office of Transition Initiatives
PRRO	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation
PSC	Personal Services Contractor
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
TAP	Transitional Activity Program
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VAM	Vulnerability Assessment Mapping
WFP	World Food Program

PART III. FY 2001 PERFORMANCE NARRATIVE

A. Strategic Objective One: “Critical food needs of targeted groups met”

1. OVERALL PROGRAMMING OF TITLE II EMERGENCY PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

1.1. Introduction

The Strategic Objective 1 (SO 1) of the Office of Food for Peace-Emergency Programs strives to meet the “critical food needs of targeted groups.” Under the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, SO1 beneficiaries are food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable persons affected by conflict and/or natural disasters. A large proportion of beneficiaries is internally displaced persons (IDPs), reflecting a global upward trend of internally uprooted people.¹ Over half of the current SO1 emergency programs are complex emergencies characterized by conflict and insecurity, collapse in civil society and political stability, and lack of infrastructure, all of which pose program and operating challenges in responding effectively to food insecure populations.

The overall aim of Title II emergency food aid is to save lives and rebuild productive skills for improved livelihoods and to provide food aid in such a way that potential negative effects are avoided. As such, SO1 incorporates the “do no harm” approach in the results framework and the principles of the “five rights” into its program design and implementation. These “rights” directly link to the four intermediate results under the Strategic Objective: to provide the right food to the right people in the right place (Intermediate Result 1), at the right time (Intermediate Result 2) and in the right way (Intermediate Results 3 and 4). SO1 emergency food aid programs aim to be flexible in responding to volatile and dynamic situations, while incorporating activities to prepare programs for the transition from relief to rehabilitation, when appropriate.

1.2. Global Title II Emergency Allocations

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2001, the Office of Food for Peace Emergency Program Division (SO1) provided 697,960 metric tons of Title II emergency food aid, valued at \$406,051,900. These emergency food resources met the critical food needs of 29,890,551 food insecure and nutritionally at-risk persons affected by natural disasters and/or complex emergencies in a total of 23 countries worldwide.² Of the total amount of emergency food aid provided, approximately 220,040 metric tons (32%) were programmed directly through U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) and Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), and 271,460 metric tons (39%) through the World Food Program (WFP) Emergency Operation Programs (EMOPs). WFP’s Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs) received 206,460 metric tons (29%) to address longer-term emergencies and bridge the gap between relief and recovery.³

1.3. Regional Title II Emergency Allocations

The Africa region continued to be the largest recipient – over 75% -- of Title II emergency resources in FY 2001, with 519,690 metric tons, totaling \$307,106,000. Of the total amount provided to Africa, Ethiopia received 33% (172,590 metric tons), which reached over 2.5 million targeted beneficiaries, and thus assisted the country in averting a large-scale famine. Kenya was the second largest recipient in Africa receiving 14% (73,590 metric tons) of food aid, providing over 5.3 million people with the critical food aid required to save lives and preserve livelihoods during the drought.

71,770 metric tons valued at \$34,938,700, 10% of the overall Title II SO1 resource total, were provided to the Asia and Near East region in FY 2001. Afghanistan’s drought response absorbed 60,000 metric tons

¹ World Disasters Report, International federation of the Red Cross/RCS, 2000

² The beneficiary figure does not include three Latin American programs as they were approved too late in FY 2001 to have results. These programs will be reported in FY 2002 Annual Report.

³ Figures derive from USAID/ Food For Peace Information Systems, Line 17 Report for FY 2001.

(83%) of the region's total. North Korea received 4,000 metric tons (5%) of the region's resources to complement the 101,000 metric tons provided by the Department of Agriculture's 416(b) program.

The level of assistance provided to Europe and Eurasia was 96,670 metric tons valued at \$59,000,000, representing 14% of FY 2001 Title II assistance. The Balkan region remained the largest recipient at 51,320 metric tons (53%) for its region. It is important to note that food assistance to the Balkans has substantially decreased over the past two years,⁴ denoting the successful transition from emergency relief to reconstruction/development. Latin America and the Caribbean countries received 9,830 metric tons, valued at \$4,950,300, representing 1% of FY 2001 Title II resources. Note: 82%, 8,080 metric tons, of Latin American emergency food resources were approved too late in FY 2001 to have any programmatic results. The performance of these programs will be reported in the FY 2002 Annual Report .

2. DESCRIPTION OF BENEFICIARIES

2.1. Who Are The Beneficiaries?

Beneficiaries of USAID Title II emergency food aid are food insecure populations who have been directly or indirectly affected by natural or complex emergencies. More specifically, beneficiaries include refugees, internally displaced persons, repatriated persons, and persons who are malnourished or at-risk of becoming malnourished, particularly children under age five, pregnant and lactating mothers, and the elderly. Internally displaced persons (IDPs) far outnumber refugees, posing operational challenges, such as accessing IDPs in countries where the infrastructure has collapsed. Women and children account for the vast majority requiring emergency food assistance. Africa continues to be the source as well as the host to the largest number of refugees and IDPs.

2.2. How Are Beneficiaries Targeted?

Beneficiary levels are established at the outset of the program through various assessment methodologies usually conducted collaboratively by cooperating sponsors and international agencies.⁵ Continuous assessment of conditions within the situational context has proven critical to recalibrate beneficiary levels, thus better targeting beneficiaries and the level and type of assistance required.

Ration levels are established based on projected or planned beneficiary levels, types of interventions and other considerations such as, the level of external food aid dependency of the recipient population. A large proportion of targeted beneficiaries received partial or complementary rations based on season and local coping mechanisms. For example certain programs provided rations only during the pre-harvest 'hungry season,' two-four months prior to the harvest. In some cases the actual delivered rations fell short of the planned ration in terms of kcal/person/day because the number of beneficiaries increased or the rations were of inadequate nutritional quality due to delay in food delivery (See Section D, Challenges).

Addressing the specific nutritional needs of vulnerable groups is a predominate concern. Over 50% of Title II emergency programs encompassed targeted selective feeding programs -- supplementary or therapeutic feeding programs. Beneficiaries of these programs typically include children under five, pregnant and lactating women and other medically or socially vulnerable groups such as elderly and handicapped persons and hospital patients.

⁴ 86,000 metric tons were provided to the Balkan region in FY 2000.

⁵ This may include Vulnerability Assessment Mapping (VAM), nutritional surveys, data from Early Warning Systems (EWS), livelihoods assessments depending on the situation and context.

2.3. How are Beneficiaries Benefiting From Title II Emergency Programs

Emergency programs are designed to meet short- and medium-term food security requirements of beneficiaries. (See text box for a breakdown of program types.) Activities within Title II emergency programs have shifted from direct, general food aid distribution to integrating transitional development and self-reliance interventions. As emergency programs vary according to a country's contextual situation, implementing partners might encompass several of these types of activities into their interventions as well as leverage non-food items from other resources to address beneficiaries' wide-ranging needs. Over 50% of emergency programs engage beneficiaries in developing and participating in Food for Work, Food for Agriculture, Food for Asset Creation, and Food for Training activities. These emergency food aid supported activities help to begin the process of rebuilding lives and livelihoods in addition to forging the bridge from relief to development. Common activities include: rehabilitation of agriculture infrastructure (canals and irrigation construction), seed protection rations and crop diversification to promote agriculture productivity; reconstruction of houses, health facilities, latrines, potable water sources, and schools; vocational skills training; and income generating schemes. For further discussion see Section 3.2.2.

Title II Emergency Program Activities

Types of Activities in Approved Programs*	Percent of Programs
General Distribution	76%
Supplementary Feeding	53%
Therapeutic Feeding	38%
Food for Work	59%
Food for Agriculture	20%
Others: Food for Training and Food for Asset creation	47%

For definitions of the programs above see Annex Five.

* Programs usually have multiple activities.

2.4. Gender

Women play an increasingly vital role in emergency food aid programs. While women form the highest percentage of beneficiaries, they are frequently overlooked in terms of decision-making roles in activities. More than one third of Title II emergency programs reported encouraging women's participation in food distribution committees as well as training in food aid monitoring, income generation schemes, and agriculture rehabilitation activities. WFP policy is to ensure women are an integral part of the implementation strategy, thus women are actively involved in all stages of food management and distribution. The involvement of women in food aid management and distribution has been found to bring a greater sense of transparency to the process as well as impacting positively in the nutritional status of children.⁶ For example, in Uganda, WFP reported that in camps for Sudanese refugees, women comprised 60% of food management committees, and more importantly, over half occupied leadership roles within the committees.⁷ While WFP's gender policy includes mandatory gender disaggregation in monitoring and reporting, the PVO/NGO cooperating sponsors continued resource constraints to monitoring and reporting disaggregated by gender.

3. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

Achievements are reported in accordance with the SO1 Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and linked where possible to the Agency's selected performance indicators for Humanitarian Assistance. (See PART IV, Performance Monitoring Plan and Agency's Selected Performance Measures.) It should be noted that some FY 2001 targets were not projected during last year's reporting period as the assumption was a new strategic plan would be developed with a revised results framework and corresponding targets. As the new strategic plan was deferred until FY 2002, SO1 utilized previous target trends to calculate the remaining targets that had not been projected.

⁶ Okondo, H et al. Gender Assessment of Selected Review Committees in Kenya: A filed Mission Report, Field Exchange 12, April 2001

⁷ WFP Uganda PRRP 6176, Performance Review Questionnaire

3.1 Significant Result

Since SO1's inception in 1996/1997, the indicator to measure the SO's progress in meeting critical food needs of targeted beneficiaries, "percent of targeted population reached by food aid" has consistently exceeded its targets (See PART IV). Thus SO1 has achieved a significant result (Agency Performance Indicator 26, Table 1). In FY 2001, SO1 programs reached 29,890,551 (90.7%) beneficiaries, surpassing the target of 85%. SO1's significant result is thoroughly discussed below as it relates to meeting SO1's overall targets as well as to the Agency's Selected Performance Measures "Number of Beneficiaries."

3.2. Meeting and Exceeding Targets

3.2.1. Overall SO1 Targets

This relates to Agency Performance Indicator 18, Table 1: "If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, did it/they exceed, meet or not meet its/their targets?" Despite significant challenges (see Section 4), SO1 met its overall targets for FY 2001. SO1 also consistently met its overall targets during the life of the Strategic Plan, 1997 – 2002 which is demonstrated in SO1's Performance Monitoring Plan (See PART IV). In some cases SO1 exceeded its targets and examples of these cases are described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

3.2.1.a. SO1 Level Indicator: "Percent of targeted population reached by food aid"

This SO level indicator not only relates to Performance Indicator 18, "did it/they exceed, met or not meet its/their targets"; it also correlates to Agency Level Indicator 27, Table 1: "Number of beneficiaries."

The targeted population reached by emergency food aid has incrementally increased from the baseline of 67% in FY 1996 to 90.7% in FY 2001, hence exceeding the target. Out of 32,960,491 targeted beneficiaries, SO1's emergency food aid resources reached 29,890,551 in FY 2001. SO1 not only surpassed its target of 85% but was able to reach more targeted beneficiaries than initially planned.

Table 1: SO1: Critical Food Needs of Targeted Groups Met			
Indicator: Percent of targeted population reached by food aid (Number of beneficiaries)			
Unit of Measure: Percent of targeted population			
Definition: "Targeted population" as defined at each program's inception and stated in grant document	FY Year	Target	Actual
Data Source: Implementing partners' Quarterly and Annual reports and the Performance Review Annual Questionnaire	1996	Baseline	67%
Data Quality and limitations: Possibility of double-counting	1997	67%	74.4%
Comments: The number of targeted beneficiaries for FY 2001 was 32,960,491 and of that SO1 programs reached a total of 29,890,551.	1998	70%	77.3%
	1999	75%	82.2%
	2000	80%	82.2%
	2001	85%	90.7%

While the FY 2001 targeted population was 6% greater than FY 2000 (28,200,295), the overall metric tonnage decreased from 947,917 in FY 2000 to 697,960 in FY 2001. Thus more beneficiaries were reached with less food. Several reasons may account for this: 1) partial or complementary rations provided on a seasonal basis to preserve coping mechanisms and decrease dependency; 2) increase in food aid assistance provided by other donors to WFP programs; 3) more efficient distribution mechanisms and more effective targeting.

It is important to note that while some programs reached or even exceeded their planned beneficiary levels, others did not (See PART IV): 90.7% is an overall average. The likelihood of reaching an overall

100% is rare given the targets based on estimates and the volatile, dynamic context in which emergency food aid is programmed.

3.2.1.b. SO1 Level Indicator: Percent of programs reporting improved or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups

This indicator is loosely linked to Agency Level Indicator 3, Table 3: “Number/proportion of emergency sites where nutritional status of children under five a) monitored and b) wasting prevalence is less than 10%.” It is not reported in the Agency Selected Performance Measure Table because the SO1 indicator lacks the specificity to track wasting prevalence.

Reporting: SO1 programs reporting improving or maintaining nutritional status of targeted groups has incrementally increased from the baseline of 37% in 1996 to 73% in 2001, thus exceeding the target of 65%. SO1 is increasingly able to provide information on the source of data to support responses: 70.5% of respondents cited survey results and ongoing monitoring data. Thus as an emerging trend, some improvements have been made in the quality and validity of implementing partners’ monitoring and reporting systems.⁸

Targeted nutritional programs: SO1 sought to strengthen targeted feeding programs implemented with Title II emergency food aid resources. In this reporting period 53% of programs with a nutritional component undertook supplementary and/or therapeutic feeding activities. (See Annex B.) These programs aim to rehabilitate those already malnourished and prevent further nutritional deterioration for “at risk groups” (under age five, pregnant and lactating women and the elderly). In many cases reporting on the effectiveness of these programs has improved, and standards are increasingly in line with international guidelines and minimum standards.⁹ Some programs, however, are implemented in an ad hoc manner with insufficient attention to technical protocols and to an exit strategy. Consequently, SOI has become more vigilant and has replaced or not funded non-performing, ineffective programs that have not adhered to basic technical or managerial standards.

SO1 commissioned a review of a Burundi program where standardized protocols for feeding programs were established by UNICEF, WFP, PVOs/NGOs and the Ministry of Health. Initial evidence suggests that developing and implementing national standardized treatment protocols for therapeutic and supplementary feeding leads to better management and coordination and improved results from feeding centers (higher cure rates and less deaths). A similar pilot has been carried out in Angola. Initial data from Angola reveal nutritional status has improved significantly in FY 2001; however, this is not yet substantiated by sufficient evidence. The initial pilot work is largely anecdotal and must be carefully evaluated and well documented before replicating it in other similar situations.

3.2.2. Other Noteworthy Results Contributing to Meeting SO1’s Targets

3.2.2.a. Intermediate Result 3: Improved Planning to Transition Relief Activities to Development Indicator: Percent of programs that have developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development

⁸ Data for this performance indicator is “as reported” by implementing partners. Primary data (collected and reported by the implementing partner) and secondary data are provided. Additional information is taken from available annual reports, nutrition survey reports (where available), evaluations, sit-reps and briefs.

⁹ The Sphere Project. Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response. Minimum Standards in Nutrition (3), 1998

The majority of PVOs and WFP programs incorporate “developmental relief” strategies in their program design and implementation. In FY 2001, 82% of Title II emergency programs reported developing resettlement or rehabilitation plans to forge a necessary link between relief and development. Although the target was not met, performance against this indicator has increased over the past three years (FY 1999 77.3% and FY 2000 81.2%), demonstrating a paradigm shift from general food distribution to activities that promote self-sufficiency such as Food for Work, Food for Agriculture and Food for Asset Creation. In addition, many implementing partners provide additional supportive data and anecdotal evidence, thus supplying the SO1 team with valuable lessons learned for future program strategy, design and implementation.

In FY 2001 Afghanistan received 83% of the total Title II emergency resources for the Central Asia region, most of which was implemented by WFP and the Aga Khan Foundation USA/FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance. Food for Asset Creation is a flexible approach used by WFP and implementing partners to respond to specific and local food needs.¹ The Food for Asset Creation activity provided food rations to both able and non-able workers in specific communities to rehabilitate and reconstruct roads, irrigation channels, schools, and health clinics. These efforts enabled the most food insecure households who were unable to work to access food rations, while able-bodied workers rehabilitated viable infrastructure to improve livelihoods of the entire community. These programs prevented displacement in these drought-affected communities. In remote areas such as Gorno-Badakhshan in the far north-eastern corner of Afghanistan, critical road construction allowed isolated areas access to local markets for exchanging goods, resulting in lower prices of food and other basic goods as well as reducing transportation costs.¹ This is further explored in a case study (see AnnexV)

WFP, in partnership with CARE in Sudan, successfully resettled 3,600 internally displaced persons (IDPs) who were entirely dependent on food aid for over seven years. As part of the resettlement program these IDPs were provided with food rations to construct hafirs as a source of drinking water for the En Nahud and Western Kordofan communities. Land was also provided to the IDPs from the government, thus enabling them to secure their own food needs and sustain their lives and livelihoods without further external assistance.¹⁰

3.2.2.b. Intermediate Result 4: Strengthened Capabilities of Cooperating Sponsors and Host Country Entities to Manage Emergency Food Aid Programs

Indicator: Percent of programs strengthening counterparts/local groups

Although the targets for this indicator have not been consistently met over the years, in FY 2001, all of Title II's implementing partners reported a capacity building component within their emergency programs (see PMP, PART IV). Implementing partners strive to strengthen capacity of local partners, forging links among government, local authorities, and community groups resulting in local ownership of community activities, and thus increasing the likelihood of sustainability. These interventions are diverse and context-specific ranging from leadership training, using participatory planning techniques to build local capacity and community targeting mechanisms, to providing technical assistance in environmental-friendly agricultural practices.

Kosovo is a good example of how a well-coordinated strategy (a large portion being capacity building) culminated in the country's successful transition from emergency relief to reconstruction. WFP took the lead in developing and executing a strategic approach of phasing in local distribution partners (NGOs) and the Government's Centers of Social Work units, by strengthening their skills to provide social assistance to needy families while gradually phasing out its presence in general food aid distribution. As a result, many Centers of Social Work and local distribution partners are closely working together, and sustainable and professional mechanisms have been established in some municipalities. The country's Social Assistance Scheme has been fully integrated into the government's social assistance system, and in most places the scheme is functioning well. WFP is gradually phasing-out its assistance from 100,000 beneficiaries in April 2001 to 70,000 in October 2001.¹¹ The Kosovo example is more thoroughly explained in Annex V, under SO1's Program Highlights.

¹⁰ EMOP 6125, South, Transitional Regions and Eastern Region of Sudan (implemented with UNICEF, ACF, CARE, GOAL, OXFAM, SCF-UK and SCF-US). Performance Review Questionnaire, submitted January 2002.

¹¹ E-mail from WFP/Kosovo, February 2002.

Indicator: Percent of cooperating sponsors' programs able to meet reporting requirements (i.e. submitted all reports due).

In FY 2001, SO1 did not have the human resources to maintain the mechanism that had been put in place to track cooperating sponsor compliance with reporting requirements. Nonetheless, it is clear from a review of the files that the trend begun in 1999 continued, e.g. the number of cooperating sponsors submitting timely reports is declining. Since SO1's requirements were not substantively changed during the period, it seems likely that a major contributing factor continued to be SO1's inability to follow-up, which should be manifested in reminders to the cooperating sponsors, followed by closure of the cooperating sponsor's program if not corrected. With the anticipated staffing additions and the establishment of the new institutional support contractor in FY 2002, SO1 expects to reestablish appropriate tracking mechanisms and follow-up actions.

This year Congress accelerated the annual performance reporting requirements by several months. Thus SO1's notice to the cooperating sponsors had to be issued during the holiday season with very short deadlines, which clearly contributed to the less than 100% response to the questionnaire from the cooperating sponsors. USAID has also been informed that the performance reporting on FY 2002 will be due even earlier – by the end of calendar 2002, which will further strain the cooperating sponsor's capacity to report in a timely and in depth manner.

3.2.3. Crude Mortality Rate (CMR)

When monitored over time, the CMR is an indicator of the overall situation and success of interventions. When used in conjunction with data on nutritional status it is highly valuable in providing an inclusive picture to better interpret findings. For example in this reporting period, the SO 1 team supported a study to investigate recurrent micro-nutrient deficiency outbreaks in a province in Angola. Findings revealed a widespread micro-nutrient problem, not reflected in the wasting rates, since the form of malnutrition in this situation does not cause wasting but leads to significant health problems and death. The CMR on the other hand was extremely inflated, thus indicative of a serious problem. This kind of analysis and reporting can assist significantly in directing the right kind of food at the right time to the right people.

CMR is not included in the SO1 results framework as a performance indicator and cannot as yet be related to Agency Performance Indicator 44 "Number/proportions of emergency sites where the crude mortality rate is (a) monitored and (b) has declined from its initial value." However, the SO1 team used Title II emergency Institutional Support Assistance (ISA) resources to pioneer the pilot testing of a methodology that integrates the collection of the CMR into ongoing nutrition surveys. The methodology was tested by World Vision in Sudan and was found to be feasible for cooperating sponsors to implement. USAID is encouraging its partners and other donors to use these indicators as part of programming monitoring. During the formulation of its new strategic plan, FFP/SOI will review this indicator in consultation with its partners and in coordination with DCHA and PPC.

4. CHALLENGES TO MEETING/EXCEEDING TARGETS

4.1 Program Performance Challenges

Operating Environment: The complexities and challenges of providing emergency food aid requires an understanding of the range of circumstances and fluidity of change within the target countries. In complex emergency countries, such as Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Angola or Burundi, the operating environment can vary considerably within the country and can shift rapidly due to political, security or other circumstances. Insecurity poses a particular challenge both in terms of accessing the most vulnerable but also in determining what activities are feasible and how to mitigate risks for both beneficiaries and cooperating sponsor staff. The increasing number of complex emergencies makes it extremely challenging to design programs that are performance-based but also flexible enough to respond to unforeseen crises such as mass displacement or a sudden influx of beneficiaries. Thus interventions must be inherently flexible. Continuous assessment has proven critical to recalibrate beneficiary numbers as well as levels and types of assistance required.

Food aid delivery and distribution: Although SO1 was not able to track the data in FY 2001 for the indicator related to pipeline shortages (IR2, “% of programs experiencing Title II pipeline shortages”) the performance assessment data (1997-2000) and 2001 questionnaire responses indicate that efforts are still needed to improve the delivery of Title II commodities on a timely basis. To mitigate against pipeline breaks, SO1 maintains an assortment of commodities pre-positioned in a U.S. port which can eliminate 2-3 months of time normally needed for the call forward, purchase and delivery of commodities for shipment. As in previous years, the most frequent reported cause of food distribution delay was security problems, although breakdowns in infrastructure, shortage of trucks and poor government logistics are a common reason for food delays. When food does not arrive on schedule, various means were used to minimize schedule disruptions and adverse effects on beneficiaries, including local purchase of non-Title II resources, borrowing commodities from other pipelines, airlifting rations, distributing incomplete food baskets or reduced rations, and recalibration of beneficiary levels. Innovative use of local transport also ensured food reached those in need: in Afghanistan donkeys were used to transport Title II food rations because of impassable road conditions. SO1 approved small “contingency stock” mechanisms for two cooperating sponsors in southern Sudan in order to assure that sufficient commodities were available to respond to sudden spikes in needs or pipeline breaks among the food aid agencies.

Food basket quality and appropriateness: For food aid programs which rely on multiple donors, such as WFP’s, intermittent shortages of commodities in the food basket are a persistent and critical problem causing fluctuating ration levels and nutritional problems such as the micronutrient outbreaks in northern Kenya and Kuito, Angola. It is also a continuous challenge to ensure suitable commodities in the food basket for all groups in the population. In Afghanistan, wheat is the staple and efforts were made to ensure that this preferred staple was delivered. It became clear to the SO1 team that wheat alone could not meet beneficiary needs, particularly those of infants and small children; subsequently, SO 1 persuaded WFP to add complementary commodities (CSB, oil and pulses) to the food basket.

Decline in USDA 416(b) availability: From FY 1999 through 2002, large amounts of “surplus” commodities acquired through USDA’s Section 416 (b) “ad hoc humanitarian assistance authority” were made available for emergency response activities. SO1 coordinated closely with USDA on programmatic issues to assure that Title II emergency resources and timelines were complimentary rather than competing with the 416(b) resources. While these additional resources were crucial in meeting the growing emergency food aid requirements worldwide, they were a significant additional management burden for an already inadequate number of SO1 staff to assure adequate coordination and tracking of these resources. There will be no Section 416(b) resources in FY 2003, however it is proposed in the President’s FY 2003 budget currently before Congress to provide an additional \$292 million in Title II to help offset the loss of the section 416(b) resources for emergency response. If the final FY 2003 appropriation does not provide such an offset, FFP will not have sufficient Title II resources to support the worldwide emergency requirements at the 1999-2002 USG levels and will propose drawing resources from the Emerson Trust.

4.2 Challenges Faced by Operational Unit

Staffing: The previously reported inadequate approved staff slots allocated to FFP (emergency and development) compared to the size of the resources to be managed continued to be problematic in FY 2001, posing an enormous constraint for SO1’s performance. In addition, frequent staff turnover as well as the complex and protracted process for recruiting both U.S. direct hires and Personal Service Contractors (PSCs) also contributed to gaps in staffing. Chronic understaffing also makes it difficult to respond effectively to highly visible emergencies, such as the Afghanistan drought, as human resources must be pulled from already large portfolios, diminishing SO1’s critical programming and monitoring capabilities for on-going programs. SO1 is working on approvals of additional PSC slots as well as filing the USDH and PSC slots already approved.

New Initiative: A new commodity initiative mandated by Congress in 2001, the International Food Aid Program Act or “Breedlove” has further stretched staffing resources. Nonetheless, SO1 successfully negotiated and awarded four “Breedlove” grants to begin the pilot phase. The process has been very labor-intensive to educate potential new suppliers and cooperating sponsors about designing and

implementing effective emergency food aid commodities and programs. FFP also has participated on the production side.

Increased demands for information: While FFP welcomes the opportunity to tell its story, information requests increased sharply from within USAID and from other US agencies i.e., STATE, NSC, DoD, particularly for “high profile” programs. As a result, a substantial amount of staff time was consumed in garnering and reporting the requested information. This placed further burdens on limited staff.

Monitoring of WFP's Programs: Official WFP reporting must be approved and issued via the headquarters, with annual country-specific and global reports routinely issued at least a year after the end of the reporting period. Thus WFP reports have not provided a viable, timely monitoring or reporting mechanism for SO1. Unofficial pipeline and status report which individual SO1 staff may be able to garner often do not report on distributions by donor, making it extremely difficult to determine how much of the Title II commodities have been used, where and for which activities. FFP continues to dialogue with WFP on ways to satisfactorily address this issue.

Delayed strategic plan: During FY 2002, a new strategic plan will be prepared for the next five-year cycle. Changes in the operating environment and lessons learned since 1997 will be reviewed and reflected in the new Strategic Plan. The current results framework and its corresponding performance indicators will be reviewed as dialogue begins with partners to ensure they are appropriate and useful for program management and feasible in terms of our cooperating sponsors' reporting capacities.

Program Coordination: Title II emergency programs are planned and implemented in close collaboration with a wide array of stakeholders, including USAID regional bureaus, Missions and other offices within DCHA. Within the Office of Food for Peace, there is also close coordination with the Development Division (SO2) in Title II food aid resource management and programming. Programs are often linked to OFDA's operations that provide seeds, tools, and other non-food resources to complement Title II food commodities. Among the USG agencies, USAID coordinates on policy and program issues with the State Department, the National Security Council, Department of Defense, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). SO1 also relies on close coordination with other donors such as the European Union (EU) and CIDA, and international agencies such as UNICEF and UNHCR.

Collaboration with PVOs: As noted in Section 1.2, 32% of emergency Title II resources (220,040 metric tons) were programmed directly through PVOs and NGO. This level of PVO programming continues a downward trend over several years, for which there can be several explanations. In some circumstances, such as Kenya or the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), WFP is the best positioned to successfully appeal for resources and/or manage a food aid pipeline and PVOs choose to work through WFP. In other places, such as Angola, the PVOs shifted their program focus into recovery and developmental activities while WFP maintained the primary responsibility for a smaller emergency response mechanism. SO1 will continue to seek ways to encourage the PVOs to increase their direct participation in emergency food aid programs.

5. DATA QUALITY AND LIMITATIONS

The figures from the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) are derived from annual Performance Review Questionnaires completed by each PVO and WFP program. Data from the questionnaires are extracted and then collated into a database. Other sources of information include annual and quarterly reports, evaluations, briefs, and FFP monitoring visits in the field. While considerable progress has been made since 1996 in program tracking, both the questionnaire and database for results monitoring require modification to facilitate data entry, analysis, and better use as management tools.

During the strategic planning process 2002-2006, rigorous consultations will be undertaken with SO1's partners in developing its revised results framework to meet both the SO1's reporting and monitoring requirements as well as the Agency's selected indicators. The real challenge for FFP is to select meaningful indicators on which all PVOs and WFP can report, as some partners do not have the capacity

to track the CMR and other crucial nutritional indicators. A standardized system of data collection for indicators must also be discussed among all partners in order to improve data quality. As noted above, the questionnaire and database require modifications to better track and utilize information as both a useful decision-making and performance reporting tool. This will occur subsequent to SO1's approved results framework.

B. Strategic Objective Two: *“Increased effectiveness of FFP’s partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity”*

1. INTRODUCTION

Food security is often the most important, fundamental concern facing the poorest households in developing countries. The United States P.L. 480 Title II development (non-emergency) food aid program constitutes the single largest source of USAID funding focused on food security. It enjoys substantial support from a unique combination of U.S. political, agricultural, commercial and non-governmental sectors.

USAID’s 1995 Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper guides program development and resource allocation for all USAID administered food aid activities. The Office of Food for Peace SO2 Team administers Title II development programs - a \$426 million dollar portfolio. Faith-based and other private, non-governmental organizations (Cooperating Sponsors) directly implement approximately \$379 million of Title II development programming, while the World Food Program implements the remaining \$47 million. Programmed in-kind and sold in needy countries, development food aid is used to improve food access, availability, and utilization. Food aid directly supplements the diet of young children and pregnant and lactating mothers, and when used as food for work (FFW) mobilizes poor people's labor to feed families and build local commercial and agricultural infrastructure necessary for sustainable rural development. Commodity sales (monetization) encourage local and U.S. market development by promoting private sector participation. The local currency proceeds of these sales are used to implement critical interventions that help insure that the program's longer-term objective of sustainable increases in food security is met. Monetization proceeds are used to support the provision of basic health services, nutrition education, agricultural extension and training, and local capacity building. Title II development food aid, when fully integrated with other USAID resources, enhances the effectiveness of child survival, agriculture, income generation, basic education and community development activities targeting the rural poor.

In the past year, approximately 85% of Title II development resources supported activities directed at improving food utilization (maternal and child health and nutrition, and water and sanitation) and food access and availability (agricultural marketing, productivity and natural resource management), the priority technical areas of intervention designed to attack the root causes of food insecurity (see table 1). Priority was also given to Title II development activities in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia—the most chronically food insecure regions of the world.

One half of Title II development resources directly implemented by Cooperating Sponsors, approximately \$186 million, is used to support **Agriculture** and **Natural Resource Management** activities. Community-level programs work with small farmers and their families, providing technical assistance and training to promote sustainable farming practices, more productive and diversified farming systems, and improved post-harvest management and marketing. Many Cooperating Sponsors work in close collaboration with international and national agricultural research centers, to help disseminate and adapt locally appropriate technologies. Title II agriculture activities often include the improvement of physical resources through the construction of small-scale irrigation and drainage systems, as well as soil and water conservation infrastructure and rural road rehabilitation through food for work programs. These activities increase the sustainability of the production systems, thereby contributing to improvements in the availability and access to food by poor rural households, now and in the future.

More than one-third of Title II development resources, approximately \$133 million, is used in **Health and Nutrition** and **Water and Sanitation** activities. These resources directly support proven interventions to improve child survival and nutrition, such as promotion of exclusive breastfeeding, prevention and treatment of preventable childhood diseases, increased micronutrient consumption, and improvements in antenatal care. Most Title II health and nutrition programs include supplementary feeding components, through the provision of take-home rations to pregnant and lactating women, and their young children.

The presence of Title II development multi-year programs in countries subject to recurring natural disasters or civil and economic crises provides a ready-made basis for rapid emergency response. Title II development programs help provide a pipeline of resources and network of implementing partners to help respond to natural disasters or crises as they occur. In areas prone to natural disasters or crises, the SO2 Team encourages the Cooperating Sponsors to develop plans to deal with the transitory food insecurity caused by an emergency while keeping the development activity on track. The Office of Food for Peace also encourages Cooperating Sponsors to include direct distribution components in their development programs, in part to have commodities available in-country to respond to sudden-onset emergencies. Approximately \$30 million Title II development resources are programmed for these and other **Non-Emergency Humanitarian Assistance** activities, including support for vulnerable children and orphans affected by HIV/AIDS.

Approximately \$30 million in Title II development resources support **Food for Education** (FFE) activities that integrate food resources with other government and donor-funded programs to improve the quality of education. The governments in countries where FFE activities are implemented usually are enacting large-scale school reform programs to improve the quality of the education system. Additionally, many FFE activities include components focused on increasing girls' attendance and educational attainment.

A limited amount of Title II development funding, approximately \$4 million, supports non-farm **Micro-Enterprise** programs designed to expand off-farm income earning opportunities. Many credit activities are gender-targeted, thereby increasing short- and longer-term access to resources by women.

U.S. food assistance is grounded in American humanitarianism. The primary beneficiaries of Title II development programs are the more than 800 million food insecure people in the developing countries. The Title II development program also benefits the U.S. economy both directly and indirectly, through the purchase of U.S. goods and services and by promoting economic growth in recipient countries. Millions of dollars worth of agricultural commodities and processed fortified food products, such as wheat flour, refined soybean oil and blended cereals, are purchased for USAID's P.L. 480 programs. The processed commodities are packaged in containers that are produced and printed in the U.S. And the majority of commodities are shipped to recipient countries on U.S. flag carriers. When food assistance is used to support development activities it effectively alleviates poverty and promotes local economic growth in recipient countries. As incomes in developing countries rise, consumption patterns change and imports increase. Aid leads to trade, and American exporters benefit.

2. OVERVIEW

In FY 2001, the Office of Food for Peace SO2 Team supported 20 NGO Cooperating Sponsors¹² implementing 84 Title II development activities in 20 Sub-Saharan Africa countries, 3 countries in South Asia, and 6 countries in Latin America (see Annex A for a list of FY 2001 programs.) The total FY 2001 approved value¹³ of these activities was **\$379 million**, complemented by **\$11 million** in section 202(e) cash funding¹⁴ to cover the dollar costs associated with field implementation of Title II food aid activities.

Title II development activities support interventions in 6 technical areas, with a focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity (see table 1.)

¹² Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), ACDI/VOCA, Africare, Church World Services, Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Caritas Peru, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Counterpart International, Doulos Community, Ethiopian Orthodox Church, Food for the Hungry (FHI), Mercy Corps, Prisma Peru, Project Concern International (PCI), Relief Society of Tigrey (REST), Save the Children (SCF/USA), Share, Technoserve, World Vision, Inc. (WVUS).

¹³ Total value includes commodity plus freight.

¹⁴ 202(e) funding level includes only FY 2001 funds allocated for FY 2001 activities. It does not include FY 2000 202(e) forward funding for FY 2001 activities nor FY 2001 202(e) used to forward fund FY 2002 activities.

Table 1. FY 2001 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives by Food Security Component.		
Food security component	% commodity volume (MT)	% value (commodity + freight)
Health & Nutrition	29	35
Agriculture	56	49
Education	8	8
Micro-Enterprise	1	1
General Relief	7	8
Total FY 2001 Title II Development Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives	1,206,980 MT	\$378.7 Million
Title II Development Funding through the World Food Program	138,660MT	\$ 47.3 Million
Total FY 2001 Title II Development Funding	1,345,640 MT	\$426 Million

3. ACHIEVEMENTS

During FY 2001, the SO2 Team faced a significant management challenge with the turnover of approximately one half of the Title II development portfolio. A total of 43 FY2003-2007 Development Assistance Program (DAP) proposals were reviewed within the legislative requirement of a 45-day period for mission comments then a 45-day period for Washington review and transmittal to the Cooperating Sponsor of specifics on how the proposal needs to be improved. Cooperating Sponsors then submitted improve submissions based on the feedback received, and the majority was approved.

Strengthened integration and documented field-level impacts were achieved during FY 2001. The level of mission involvement in the Washington reviews was impressive. Almost all of the missions with DAPs under consideration participated in the DC-based reviews. The Team considers this an indication of increased mission involvement in the integration of Title II resources into their strategies, and a recognition of the importance of the Title II development program to the objectives they are trying to achieve. This improved integration of Title II resources into Mission's strategies, which is a key management focus of the Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper and the Strategic Objective #2 (SO2) Team, is facilitated by the SO2 Team's engagement in the review of Mission strategic plans. For example, during FY 2001, the Team collaborated closely with the Kenya mission to articulate the contribution Title II programs make to the Mission's objectives, to integrate Title II development programs into the Mission's strategic plan, and to increase the Title II levels for Kenya.

The Office of Food for Peace represents the USG on the Executive Board of the World Food Program. During FY 2001, the Office participated in three executive board meetings to set WFP policy directions, and reviewed country strategic outlines and program proposals to insure a strong relationship among WFP policies and programs, USG priorities and on-going host country government programs.

The SO2 Team's objective is to increase the effectiveness of Title II implementing partners in achieving results in food security, with a focus on increasing agricultural productivity and improving household nutrition. During FY 2001, the Title II development programs showed a modest increase in the percent of results achieved, from 55% in FY 2000 to 61% in FY 2001. The improvement is greater when performance of the set of programs that reported results for both FY 2000 and FY 2001 is compared. The average percent of results achieved by this smaller group of programs was 58% in FY 2000 and 65% in FY 2001. However, neither set of results comes close to the 90% target set by the SO2 Team at the inception of the SO, and thus the SO target was not met. The Team has recognized that the SO2 indicator of percent of results achieved is an imperfect measure of performance, and doesn't assist the Agency in telling the success stories of the Title II development program. As discussed below, the Team

will look at different performance reporting strategies based on the objective of the FY 2003 – 2007 Strategic Plan.

However, the results achieved by the Title II development programs remain impressive. Annex 2 – Success Stories, provides the following examples of the successes of these community-based, integrated development programs.

- Increased resiliency to natural disasters of rural households in Mozambique.
- Indonesia programs combat radicalism by helping the poor recover from economic and political crisis.
- CARE program integrates Mission and Title II funding to help internally displaced Angolan families return home and farm again.
- Existence of Title II non-emergency programs supports emergency response in Kenya.
- Integrated program improves nutritional status in Bolivia and Madagascar.
- Improved nutritional status and nutrition behaviors in Benin.
- Credit directed at women improves livelihoods – present and future.
- Improvements in economic and food security status through empowerment of women in Burkina Faso.

An important focus of the Policy Paper, and an IR under SO2, is increased integration of Title II with DA and other USAID resources. The challenges of different procurement cycles and requirements have made it difficult to maximize opportunities to co-finance DAPs. During FY 2001, the Team developed a hybrid assistance mechanism that permits obligation of DA and Title II funds in a single assistance instrument. This should facilitate the funding of integrated programs. However, unless the Agency is successful in increasing DA funds and expertise in sectors such as agriculture, opportunities for resource integration will continue to be limited.

During FY 2001, the Team used DA resources for a number of activities aimed at strengthening programming and implementation of Title II development resources. FFP received \$343,000 in "vulnerable children" funds to explore issues and options for HIV mitigation. These resources were used to support programs in Kenya, Malawi, and Rwanda. For example, in Kenya, the resources were used to undertake field assessments of how best to use Title II food aid to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS. The resources were split across four Cooperating Sponsors, each of which undertook an assessment in their program area. In Rwanda, CARE utilized these resources to assist child-headed households to attend skills-building classes. The activities were coordinated along with food distribution to achieve maximum participation.

As part of the analytic agenda to inform the FY 2003 – FY 2007 Strategic Plan, the Team asked the GH/HNID Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance project to conduct an assessment of progress in implementing the Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper. The assessment, which started in FY 2001 and will be finalized in March 2002, reports on whether the Title II development programs have been successful in achieving and reporting on the food security goals laid out in the Policy Paper. In addition to sector-specific programmatic and performance monitoring and reporting issues, the assessment examines crosscutting policy issues that may facilitate or impede achievement of food security results, and presents a series of important recommendations to improve policy and program management of the Title II development program, directed largely at the Office of Food for Peace, the Cooperating Sponsors and Congress. The assessment found that the Office of Food for Peace and its Cooperating Sponsor and Mission partners have responded to the goals set forth in the policy paper including: greater focus on the most food insecure regions and countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa; increased emphasis on improving agricultural productivity and household nutrition, including a dramatic improvement in the design of Title II agricultural and nutrition programs with the integration of complementary activities such as technical assistance and training, largely funded by monetization; better results and results reporting; and better collaboration among partners. However, the assessment also highlighted the constant tension arising from the pressure to use commodity resources as food and the need for cash resources for

sustainable impacts. The importance of transparency, consistency, flexibility and communication in the management of the program by the Office of Food for Peace was also emphasized.

The Team also initiated, through Michigan State University, case studies of country programs where commodity sales (monetization) were used to achieve food security results. The study documents positive impacts of monetization to the recipient country, which range from foreign exchange savings, stabilized food supplies and prices reaching the urban poor, to stimulating private commerce and processing industries. The greatest impact of monetization is however, the results of the development activities performed using the proceeds from the sale of commodities. Monetization proceeds are used for the costs associated with distributing commodities in food for work, nutritional supplementation for pregnant and lactating mothers and young children, and in food for education and humanitarian feeding programs. Increasing use of monetization to support non-distribution food security activities is perhaps the single most important change in the Title II program since the inception of the Policy Paper. These “complementary” activities have permitted the programs to achieve the successes that they have.

4. CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES – A NEW STRATEGIC PLAN

During FY 2002, the SO2 Team will develop a Strategic Plan for the FY 2003–FY 2007 period. The development of the Strategic Plan presents the Team and the Agency with an opportunity to address issues that have become increasingly important over the course of the current plan. The Strategic Plan needs to establish a framework to maximize the contributions of the Title II development program to the DCHA objectives, within the programmatic and legislative parameters set by the Farm Bill and Administration policy, the manageable interest of the SO2 Team and the human, OE and DA resources available to the Team.

The Strategic Plan and its associated Results Framework should also reflect the cross-cutting nature of the Title II development program, which makes important contributions to goals in the Economic Growth, Trade, and Agriculture (EGAT) and Global Health (GH) pillar bureaus. The challenge facing the Team and the Agency is to insure efficient intra-agency coordination, and develop a performance reporting plan that reports the contribution of the Title II development program to goals in all three pillar bureaus, without overburdening the Team and its partners with unrealistic reporting requirements. In addition, the Strategic Plan should address a process for establishing a more competitive mechanism for the allocation of Title II development resources, given the prospects for limited opportunities for growth in the size of the program and the number of players in coming years.

The Title II development program is located in the Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) pillar bureau, and has a critical role to play in the implementation of a developmental relief approach. The non-emergency activities contribute most to the Agency Goal of “Lives saved, suffering associated with natural or man-made disasters reduced, and conditions necessary for political and/or economic development re-established” and to the Pillar Strategic Objectives addressing Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance. Title II development food aid programs are a mechanism for increasing stability to avoid conflict, by addressing the root causes of food insecurity that contribute to conflict, and restoring stability after conflict, natural disasters and economic crises, particularly where there have been disruptions in markets. Through the focus on sustainable improvements in household food security, Title II development programs help mitigate the potential impacts of natural and man-made emergencies, by strengthening the resiliency and coping ability of households. Additionally, Title II development activities often play a critical, though frequently unrecognized role in strengthening civil society. Title II Cooperating Sponsors work with community-level counterparts, both governmental and non-governmental in strengthening local capacity for strategic planning and decision making, promoting local ownership of the development process, and supporting and reinforcing decentralization policies in many countries. Title II development activities help to lay the groundwork upon which sustainable participation and democracy are built.

The majority of countries in which Title II operates suffer from poor and/or unequal natural resource endowments or recurring natural disasters or man-made crises, leading to poor access, availability, and utilization of food. The development food aid resource is uniquely suitable to agricultural resource-poor

countries, and others that are in transition and recovery. It is less appropriate for countries that have achieved a level of development whereby they are able to meet their food needs through a combination of local production, commercial imports, and social safety nets, or for those countries that are in a perpetual state of conflict and anarchy. The FY 2003-2007 SO2 Strategic Plan should support nations with Title II development programs according to a countrywide food security assessment, identifying food security objectives that can be addressed through a combination of food distribution and complementary activities, such as nutritional education and delivery of agricultural extension messages.

There are three options for the focus of the Strategic Objective for the FY 2003–FY 2007 Strategic Plan, which represent different tradeoffs among what is within the Team's manageable interest, what is relevant and has resonance for a wider audience and performance reporting challenges. The most ambitious and difficult objective would be one that directly relates to the food security results achieved by the implementing partners in the field. The most straightforward objective would focus on the internal processes that the Team must implement to insure that the Title II resources are programmed efficiently. The current focus of SO2, improved capacity of the implementing partners to achieve results, falls between being directly accountable for people-level results and being accountable for the process of resource allocation.

One of the biggest difficulties the SO2 Team faced with the existing Strategic Plan was implementing a reliable performance monitoring system. Over the past five years, most of the performance indicators originally identified have been dropped, either because they were not sufficiently sensitive measures of improved effectiveness, capacity or resource integration, or because a consistent, reliable source of information was not available to quantify them. If the SO of the new Strategic Plan is the same or similar to the existing SO - focusing on improved partner capacity - the team will still face significant challenges in implementing a performance reporting system.

If the new Strategic Objective directly relates to the food security results achieved in the field - improved household resilience and capacity to cope with chronic and transitory food insecurity by insuring the household's capacity to produce, access and adequately utilize food at all times – the Team will have to rely on the performance reporting by the Cooperating Sponsors and Missions. There are still significant limitations in the consistency and comparability of the results reported by individual programs, which has constrained the Team's ability to report aggregated results from the Title II development program. If the performance monitoring strategy for the new Strategic Plan relies more heavily on results reporting by the partners, increased resources and a more concentrated effort to assist them in improving data collection and reporting will be needed.

If the new SO focuses on the delivery of humanitarian assistance - i.e. documenting that "the right food got to the right people at the right time" (process and output-level indicators) - performance reporting will be much easier, but it will not provide the information needed by the Agency to demonstrate the establishment of the conditions necessary for, and progress towards, food security in the countries receiving Title II development food aid.

The Strategic Plan also needs to address a process for establishing a more competitive mechanism for the allocation of Title II development resources. As of September 2001, the program used approximately 1,530 million metric tons in grain equivalents. Low commodity prices have helped to achieve close to the sub-minimum, and had it not been for significant fall-out at the end of the year the program would have exceeded the sub-minimum.¹⁵ In terms of emergency programs, the United States has relied on Section 416(b) resources to meet emergency requirements over the past several years: resources that may not be available in future years. The expected reduction of Section 416(b) and continuing high levels of emergency demand may put severe pressure on Title II development resources. Unless additional funding is made available, FFP does not intend to approve development programs in excess of the sub-minimum. This means that there may be limited opportunities for growth in the size of the program and

¹⁵ P. L. 480 section 204(a)(2) "Minimum Non-Emergency Assistance" requires that: "...the Administrator shall make agricultural commodities available for non-emergency food distribution through eligible organizations under section 202 in an amount that for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2002 is not less than 1,550,000 metric tons.

the number of players in coming years. These constraints are compounded by existing limitations in opportunities for monetization and the Administration policy of reducing the monetization of food aid. Thus, there is a clear need to transition to a more competitive process for allocation of resources among countries, and among Cooperating Sponsors within countries. Any process would need to include procedures to for notify Cooperating Sponsors of opportunities in countries, and to notify countries that the Title II development program should start phasing out. This will involve intensive consultation with Title II partners, particularly the Cooperating Sponsors and Regional Bureaus.

To inform the development of a more competitive and rational process for resource allocation, the SO2 Team intends to carry out a study to examine different criteria and time frames for graduating out of development food aid, and identify when food aid might be a legitimate response in non-low-income food-deficit countries. The study would consider a country's public policies, including the existence of public safety nets, and issues of free trade and income distribution. The findings of the study will be reflected in the FY 2005 DAP Guidelines.

In FY 2001, over 64% of the total value of Private Voluntary Organization (PVO) development Title II food aid was monetized. This level of monetization represents a significant change in the nature of food aid programs since the Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper was adopted in 1995, permitting programs to better address the root causes of malnutrition. However, bulk commodities are often used in monetization because of their easier marketability, making it more difficult to meet the 75% value-added mandate. During FY 2001, FFP implemented policy guidance that required Cooperating Sponsors to program a country level of 25 percent direct distribution (value-added) commodities. However, these and other monetization guidelines currently in effect have not succeeded in significantly increasing the percentage of the program that is direct distribution using processed, bagged, or blended commodities. All indications are that the value-added mandate will be continued in the new Farm Bill, accompanied by an increase in Section 202(e) cash resources. In the near future USAID and OMB will need to agree to FY 2004 guidance on monetization for development programs.

The Title II development program also supports the goals of the Economic Growth, Trade, and Agriculture (EGAT) and Global Health (GH) pillar bureaus. The challenge facing the Agency is to recognize the program's contributions to DCHA, EGAT and GH goals. The Agency needs to explicitly address how intra-agency coordination should take place. One possibility is to use the agriculture, health, nutrition (if reinstated), and private sector councils, by including discussion of Title II program issues on council agendas, and having council participants participate in program reviews. A second challenge is to adequately reflect the contribution of the Title II development program to goals in all three pillar bureaus, without overburdening the Team and its partners with unrealistic reporting requirements.

PART IV: FY 2001 PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES AND RESULTS FRAMEWORKS

- SO1 Selected Performance Measures
- SO1 Results Framework
- SO2 Selected Performance Measures

Fiscal Year 2001 SO1 Annual Report Selected Performance Measures

Indicator (All data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors	
Pillar IV: Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance - From Table 1 of the Selected Measures						
18. If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, did it/they exceed, met or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed	Met ✓	Not Met	PL 480	See Note on next page.	
USAID Objective 5: Conflict - From Table 1 of the Selected Measures						
25. Number of refugees and internally displaced persons assisted by USAID	IDPs 5,491,647	Refugees 802,570	*Other 11,298,102	PL 480	See Note on next page.	
USAID Objective 6: Humanitarian assistance following natural or other disasters – From Table 1 of the Selected Measures						
26. Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year in the area of humanitarian assistance?	Yes ✓	No	N/A	PL 480	See Note on next page.	
27. Number of beneficiaries	Male 11,480,444	Female 12,536,556	Total **29,890,551	PL 480	See Note on next page.	
USAID Objective 6: Humanitarian assistance following natural or other disasters - From Table 3 of the Selected Measures for Humanitarian Assistance						
1. Number of declared emergencies responded to in a timely manner (OFDA)	N/A					
2. Number/proportion of emergency sites where the crude mortality rate (CMR) is (a) monitored and (b) has declined from its initial value (should not exceed a CMR of 1/10,000 persons/day)	N/A					
3. Number/proportion of emergency sites where nutritional status of children under five (a) monitored and (b) wasting prevalence is less than 10%	N/A					

Notes:

Indicator 25: * Others include resettled, residents, and all others except IDPs and refugees. Not all programs report on the disaggregated categories, thus the total sum of these categories will not equal the total number of beneficiaries reached.

Indicator 27: ** 32 of the 41 submitted questionnaires disaggregated beneficiaries by gender; consequently, the total number for beneficiaries reached does not equal the sum of male and female beneficiaries.

For indicators above: The figures are derived from SO1's annual Performance Review Questionnaire completed by WFP and PVOs/NGOs recipients of Title II emergency resources for FY 2001. The data from the questionnaires are culled into SO1's database and then recorded and tracked in its PMP. Where possible monitoring visits by SO1 team members are conducted to verify numbers.

SO1 PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN -- FY 2001 Results Compared with Targets

Strategic Objective and Intermediate Results	Performance Indicators	FY 1996 Baseline	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Rating
SO1: Critical Food Needs of Targeted Groups Met (A: Actual; T: Target)	% of targeted population reached by food aid	67%	A: 74.4%	A: 77.3%	A: 82.2%	A: 82.2%	A: 90.7%	Exceeded
			T: 67%	T: 70%	T: 75%	T: 80%	T: 85%	
	% of programs reporting improved and/or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups	37%	A: 62%	A: 52.7%	A: 65.9%	A: 85.3%	A: 73%	Exceeded
			T: 37%	T: 50%	T: 55%	T: 60%	T: 65%	
IR1: Improved Targeting of Food Aid to the Most Vulnerable Populations	% of programs that have instituted a continuous process of needs assessment and recalibration of targeting	53%	A: 85%	A: 87.5%	A: 89.7%	A: 75.6%	A: 70.5%	Exceeded
			T: 55%	T: 55%	T: 60%	T: 65%	T: 70%	
	% of programs that have incorporated special nutritional needs of different targeted groups	90%	A: 67.5%	A: 70.8	A: 71.7%	A: 41.4%	A: 53%	Failed to meet
			T: 90%	T: 92%	T: 94%	T: 96%	T: 98%	
IR2: Food Aid Delivered to Target Groups on Schedule	% of programs experiencing Title II pipeline shortages	30%	A: 33%	A: 47%	A: 41%	A: 34%	A: * Not available	Failed to meet
			T: 30%	T: 25%	T: 20%	T: 20%	T: 15%	
	% of proposals reviewed & cooperating sponsors notified of decisions within 21 business days of receipt. * No longer tracked due to lack of staff resources	8%	A: 37%	A: No inf.	A: No inf.	A: No inf.	Deleted	N/A
			T: 15%	T: 50%	T: 60%	Deleted	Deleted	
IR3: Improved Planning to Transition Relief Activities to Development	% of programs that have developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development	63%	A: 73%	A: 69.4%	A: 77.3%	A: 81.8%	A: 82%	Exceeded except for FY 01
			T: 63%	T: 63%	T: 75%	T: 80%	T: 85%	
	% of programs that have paid specific attention to avoid the negative impacts of food aid in program design & implementation ("Do no harm")	60%	A: 91%	A: 88.8%	A: 88.6	A: 93.1%	A: 97%	Exceeded
			T: 65%	T: 70%	T: 75%	T: 80%	T: 85%	
IR4: Strengthened Capabilities of Cooperating Sponsors & Host Country Entities to Manage Emergency Food Aid Programs	% of ISG grants supporting emergency planning /evaluation	44%	Deleted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	% of programs strengthening counterparts/local groups	93%	A: 94%	A: 86.1%	A: 86.7%	A: 88.6%	A: 100%	Met in '97 & '01
			T: 93%	T: 93%	T: 95%	T: 95%	T: 97%	
	% of cooperating sponsors programs able to meet reporting requirements (i.e. submitted all reports due)	17%	A: 26%	A: 56.7%	A: 50%	A: 45.4%	A: **Not available	Failed to meet
			T: 25%	T: 40%	T: 60%	T: 80%	T: 100%	

The figures above represent percentage of the total number of completed questionnaires 34 of the 41 submitted. Seven completed questionnaires were not received.

* Data for this indicator is unavailable as the FFPIS report from where the data is obtained, is incomplete because of a changeover in FFP institutional support contract.

** Due to the lack of staff in FY 2001, this indicator was not tracked.

SO1 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Food for Peace Office/Emergency Programs

Strategic Objective One: Critical Food Needs of Targeted

- Percent of targeted population reached by food aid.
- Percent of programs reporting improved and/or maintenance of nutritional status of targeted groups.

Intermediate Result One: Improved Targeting of Food Aid to the Most Vulnerable Populations

- Percent of programs that have instituted a continuous process of needs assessment and recalibration of targeting.
- Percent of programs that have incorporated special nutritional needs of different targeted groups.

Intermediate Result Two: Food Aid Delivered to Target Groups on Schedule

- Percent of programs experiencing Title II pipeline shortages.
- Percent of proposals reviewed & cooperating sponsors notified of decisions within 21 business days of receipt. *No longer tracked due to lack of staff resources.

Intermediate Result Three: Improved Planning to Transition Relief Activities to Development

- Percent of programs that have developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development.
- Percent of programs that have paid specific attention to avoid the negative impacts of food aid in program design & implementation ("Do no harm").

Intermediate Result Four: Strengthened Capabilities of Cooperating Sponsors & Host Country Entities to Manage Emergency Food Aid Programs

- Percent of ISG grants supporting emergency planning /evaluation.
- Percent of programs strengthening counterparts/local groups.
- Percent of cooperating sponsors programs able to meet reporting requirements (i.e. submitted all reports due).

* No changes have been made this year.

Fiscal Year 2001 SO2 Annual Report Selected Performance Measures -- December 3, 2001

Fiscal Year 2001 SO2 Annual Report Selected Performance Measures -- December 3, 2001						
Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)	OU Response			Fund Account	Data Quality Factors	
Pillar I: Global Development Alliance: GDA serves as a catalyst to mobilize the ideas, efforts, and resources of the public sector, corporate America and non-governmental organizations in support of shared objectives						
1	Did your operating unit achieve a significant result working in alliance with the public sector or NGOs?	Yes	No	N/A X		
2	a. How many alliances did you implement in 2001? (list partners)					
	b. How many alliances do you plan to implement in FY 2002?					
3	What amount of funds has been leveraged by the alliances in relationship to USAID's contribution?					
Pillar II: Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade: USAID works to improve country economic performance using five approaches: (1) liberalizing markets, (2) improving agriculture, (3) supporting microenterprise, (4) ensuring primary education, and (5) protecting the environment and improving energy efficiency.						
4	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the EGAT pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed	Met	Not Met		
USAID Objective 1: Critical, private markets expanded and strengthened						
5	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
USAID Objective 2: More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged						
6	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
USAID Objective 3: Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable						
7	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		

USAID Objective 4: Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded						
8	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
9	a. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2001 actual)	Male	Female	Total		
	b. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2002 target)					
USAID Objective 5: World's environment protected						
10	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
11	a. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2001 actual)					
	b. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2002 target)					
Pillar III: Global Health: USAID works to: (1) stabilize population, (2) improve child health, (3) improve maternal health, (4) address the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and (5) reduce the threat of other infectious diseases.						
12	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Global Health pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed	Met	Not Met		
USAID Objective 1: Reducing the number of unintended pregnancies						
13	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
USAID Objective 2: Reducing infant and child mortality						
14	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		
USAID Objective 3: Reducing deaths and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth						
15	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A		

USAID Objective 4: Reducing the HIV transmission rate and the impact of HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries					
16	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A	
USAID Objective 5: Reducing the threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance					
17	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A	
Pillar IV: Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance					
18	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed	Met	Not Met X	Over the past five years, most of the performance indicators were dropped, either because they were not sufficiently sensitive measures of improved effectiveness, capacity or resource integration, or because a consistent, reliable source of information was not available to quantify them. The Team will be developing a new PMP as part of the FY 2003-2007 Strategic Plan.
USAID Objective 1: Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened					
19	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	
USAID Objective 2: Credible and competitive political processes encouraged					
20	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	
USAID Objective 3: The development of politically active civil society promoted					
21	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	
USAID Objective 4: More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged					
22	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X	
USAID Objective 5: Conflict					

23	Did your program in a pre-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X		
24	Did your program in a post-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No	N/A X		
25	Number of refugees and internally displaced persons assisted by USAID	Male	Female	Total		
USAID Objective 6: Humanitarian assistance following natural or other disasters						
26	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes	No X	N/A		
27	Number of beneficiaries					